

Form ACF-202 – TANF Caseload Reduction Report

Date of Completion December 20, 2012

State: Washington

Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2013

Overall Report ☐
Two-parent Report ☒

(check one)

Apply the overall credit to the two-parent participation rate?

☒ yes
☐ no

PART 1 –Eligibility Changes Made Since FY 2005

(Complete this section for EACH change)

1. Name of eligibility change: Full-Family Sanctions
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 09/01/2006
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Families in which the head of household refuses to engage in work participation activities are terminated after six months of noncompliance. During the six month period, the grant is reduced by the parent's share or 40%, whichever is greater. Prior to this change, there was no six month limit on being in sanction. This policy was implemented effective 09/01/2006. The first month in which families were terminated was February 2007 (terminations were effective 02/28/2007). Effective 07/01/2009, the sanction policy is changed to require full family sanction after 4 consecutive months of sanction. As a result, there were no cases sanctioned from July 1 through September 30, 2010.
4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change (attach supporting materials to this form): Each month, a list of cases terminated using the Sanction Reason Code 252 were reviewed to determine if the case had at least a one-month break in service after the case was closed. This identified any cases that were reinstated. The result was a list of cases that closed due to sanction and which were not reinstated the following month.
5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -71

TANF Adult Cases Terminated Due to Non Compliance Sanction in FFY 2012

Source: ESA-EMAPS and Sanction Review Panel using the ACES Data Warehouse as of December 2012

	Total Assistance Units Terminated Due to NCS	# of One Adult Cases Terminated Due to NCS	% of Total That Are One Adult Cases Terminated Due to NCS	# of Two Adult Cases Terminated Due to NCS	% of Total That Are Two Adult Cases Terminated Due to NCS
Oct-11	297	234	78.8%	63	21.2%
Nov-11	323	253	78.3%	70	21.7%
Dec-11	292	231	79.1%	61	20.9%
Jan-12	278	223	80.2%	55	19.8%
Feb-12	298	218	73.2%	80	26.8%
Mar-12	336	254	75.6%	82	24.4%
Apr-12	341	263	77.1%	78	22.9%
May-12	281	211	75.1%	70	24.9%
Jun-12	295	221	74.9%	74	25.1%
Jul-12	285	217	76.1%	68	23.9%
Aug-12	308	239	77.6%	69	22.4%
Sep-12	328	242	73.8%	86	26.2%
Monthly Avg	305	234	76.6%	71	23.4%
Annual Total	3,662	2,806	76.6%	856	23.4%

PART 1 –Eligibility Changes Made Since FY 2005

(Complete this section for EACH change)

1. Name of eligibility change: Child-Only Means Testing
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 11/01/2011
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: The rules for determining eligibility for a non-parental “child-only” TANF/SFA cash grant requires means testing non-parental child-only grants by counting the income for all household members in addition to the recipient child’s income to determine eligibility.
 - a. Means testing applies to kinship or legal guardian child-only cases.
 - b. Households with income:
 - i. At or below 200% of FPL receive a grant based on the payment standard for TANF/SFA families.
 - ii. Between 200% and 300% of FPL receive a grant based on reduced payment standards:

FPL	Payment Standard
201% thru 225% of FPL	80% of payment standard
226% thru 250% of FPL	60% of payment standard
251% thru 275% of FPL	40% of payment standard
276% thru 300% of FPL	20% of payment standard

- iii. Over 300% FPL are not eligible for a child-only cash grant.
 - c. Requires SSN for anyone in the household when needed to verify income.
 - d. Children who have been placed by a state or tribal child welfare agency and have an **open** child welfare case are **not** be subject to means testing.
 - e. The means testing assistance unit (household) includes the person applying on the child’s behalf, any dependents of the caregiver, and other persons who are financially responsible for the caregiver or the TANF child. For example: the caregiver/relative, caregiver’s spouse, caregiver’s children, and TANF/SFA recipient child(ren).
 - f. There is no resource test for non-parental child-only caretaker relative households.
 - g. Budgeting of the recipient child(ren)’s income and resources against the payment standard will remain the same but will occur only after the household means test has been applied.
 - h. Means testing doesn’t change medical, food and child care eligibility.
4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change (attach supporting materials to this form): Each month, a list of cases terminated is reviewed to determine if the case had at least a one-month break in service after the case was closed. This identified any cases that were reinstated. The result was a list of cases that closed due to means testing and which were not reinstated the following month. This policy does not affect two-parent cases.
5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: 0

PART 1 –Eligibility Changes Made Since FY 2005

(Complete this section for EACH change)

1. Name of eligibility change: 60-Month Non-Recipient Parent Time Limit
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 11/01/2011
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: In accordance with *Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5921*, the department imposes the 60-month time limit on all parents of children who receive Child-Only TANF, provided this is “consistent with federal funding requirements and makes hardship extensions available to these parents effective September 1, 2011.
4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change (attach supporting materials to this form): Each month, a list of cases terminated is reviewed to determine if the case had at least a one-month break in service after the case was closed. This identified any cases that were reinstated. The result was a list of cases that closed due to 60-month time limit for non-recipient parent child-only cases and which were not reinstated the following month. This policy does not affect two-parent

cases.

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: 0

PART 1 –Eligibility Changes Made Since FY 2005

(Complete this section for EACH change)

1. Name of eligibility change: Permanent Disqualification Due to 3 or More Non-compliance Sanction (NCS) Terminations
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 11/01/2011
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Permanent TANF/SFA disqualification for clients who have had 3 or more WorkFirst non-compliance sanction (NCS) terminations since March 1, 2007 when the NCS termination policy was implemented.
4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change (attach supporting materials to this form): Each month, a list of cases terminated is reviewed to determine if the case had at least a one-month break in service after the case was closed. This identified any cases that were reinstated. The result was a list of cases that closed due to having had 3 or more WorkFirst NCS terminations and which were not reinstated the following month.
5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: 0

TANF Adult Cases Permanently Disqualified Due to 3 or More NCS Terminations Since March 1, 2007 in FFY 2012

Source: ESA-EMAPS Annual Report using the ACES Data Warehouse as of December 2012

	Total		Permanent Disqualification Due to 3 or More Non-Compliance Sanction (NCS) Terminations ¹			
			One Adult Cases		Two Adult Cases	
	# of Families Terminated	% of Total	# of Families Terminated	% of Total	# of Families Terminated	% of Total
OCT 2011						
NOV 2011						
DEC 2011						
JAN 2012						
FEB 2012	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
MAR 2012	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
APR 2012	6	100.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%
MAY 2012	3	100.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
JUN 2012	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
JUL 2012	5	100.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
AUG 2012	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
SEP 2012	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Mo. Avg.	2	100.0%	2	84.2%	0	15.8%
Annual Cumulative	19	100.0%	16	84.2%	3	15.8%

¹ The permanent disqualification policy was implemented effective November 1, 2011. There were no cases terminated between October 1 2011 and January 1, 2012 due to this policy.

Date of Completion December 20, 2012

State: Washington

Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2013

PART 2 – Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit

(Complete Part 2 using Excel Workbook provided.)

Pro-Rata Reduction for Excess MOE – Summary

Taking into account the pro rata reduction in the FY2012 caseload due to excess MOE spending, the average monthly TANF two-parent family caseload declined by 44.9% between FY 2005 and FY 2012. After adjusting for program change impacts (full-family sanctions, child-only means testing, 60-month non-recipient parent time limits, and permanent disqualification due to 3 or more non-compliance sanction terminations) the estimated caseload reduction credit is 36.7%. The estimated overall caseload reduction credit is 37.5%. Washington therefore elects to apply the overall credit to the two-parent rate.

Washington TANF Two-Parent Caseload Data for FY 2005 and FY 2012	
FY 2005 monthly average caseload (Average TANF Caseload = 5,129 + Average SSP Caseload = 1,126)	6,255
FY 2012 monthly average caseload (Average TANF Caseload = 5,557 + Average SSP Caseload = 0)	5,557
FY 2012 monthly average caseload, adjusted for excess MOE spending	3,448
Actual Caseload decline, FY2005 to FY 2012	2,807
Adjusted Caseload decline, FY2005 to FY 2012 (Adjusted for all state policy changes = -509 average monthly closures)	2,298
Sources: TANF Data Reports (Section Three)	

Pro-Rata Reduction for Excess MOE – Process Defined

1. The State has not received confirmation of its FFY 2010 or FFY 2011 work participation rates so the relevant spending floor is 80 percent of the basic MOE amount.
2. The pro rata reduction takes into account the use of federal TANF funds spent on basis assistance. The pro rata reduction is calculated as the State excess MOE assistance expenditures divided by the average assistance cost per case, where cost is the sum of State and federal TANF funds spent on basic assistance.
3. The end result is a pro rata reduction of 20,005 MOE-funded assistance cases based upon the all-family caseload.
4. A portion of the excess MOE-funded cases are then applied toward the two-parent family caseload based upon the ratio of the two-parent caseload to the all-family caseload (10.5%). The result is 2,109 cases attributed to the two-parent family caseload.
5. The excess MOE-funded assistance cases are then subtracted above from the actual FY 2012 monthly average caseload (5,557) to yield the adjusted FY2012 caseload of 3,448.
6. The result is a caseload decline of 2,807 from FY2005 to FY2012.

7. The average monthly number of cases terminated due to full family sanctions (-509) is then added to the adjusted FY2012 caseload decline to arrive at a net caseload decline of 2,298.
8. This process results in an estimated caseload reduction credit of 36.7%. The overall caseload reduction credit is estimated to be 37.5%. Washington elects to apply the overall credit to the two-parent caseload.

Date of Completion <u>December 20, 2012</u>
State: <u>Washington</u> Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2013

PART 3 -- Certification

I certify that we have provided the public an appropriate opportunity to comment on the estimates and methodology used to complete this report and considered those comments in completing it. Further, I certify that this report incorporates all reductions in the caseload resulting from State eligibility changes and changes in Federal requirements since Fiscal Year 2005.

(Signature)

David Stillman

(Name)

Assistant Secretary, Economic Services Administration

(Title)